

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 15 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, and 14 are independent. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and requests reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Linstromberg (U.S. Patent No. 4,087,140). The Examiner also rejected claims 4-6, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Linstromberg in view of Lewis, Jr. (U.S. Patent 4,460,344) and Takasaki (U.S. Patent 4,704,882). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Linstromberg in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent 4,132,440). Still further, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Linstromberg in view of Takasaki. As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims to define the invention with greater clarity. In view of these clarifications, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Each of the amended independent claims includes that an inner door, which fits into an opening of an outer door frame, and which is *fully removable from the outer door frame* (emphasis added). By removing the inner door from the outer door frame, a tool door can be used to pull the inner door away from the outer door frame, thereby exposing any wafers stored inside of the front opening unified pod (FOUP) to the clean atmosphere of the door tool and allowing the wafers to be loaded into processing tools.

In contrast, Linstromberg discloses a cabinet having one door that includes a smaller second door and each door has a set of hinges that are asymmetrical and non-parallel to each other. In particular, Linstromberg states:

“The main door 21 also has a secondary access opening 23 to the compartment 11 that is much smaller in extent than the main door 21 and that is normally closed by a secondary closure member or door 24 *hingedly* mounted in the opening 23 about its own or second axis 26. The two axes of movement of the main door 21 and the secondary door 24 are asymmetrical with and non-parallel to each other, in this particular embodiment being at right angles to each other. The main axis is vertical as described and the second hinge axis 26 is essentially horizontal (emphasis added) (Col. 2, Lines 36-46).”

By hingedly mounting the secondary door to the main door, Linstromberg’s secondary door does not have an open position in which the secondary door is removed from the main door. Instead, by using a set of hinges, the open position of the secondary door is achieved by swinging the secondary door open on the pivot provided by the hinges. Furthermore, Linstromberg states:

“As can be seen from a comparison of FIGS. 1 and 2 magnetic armature 37 remains in engagement with the magnet 36 through *the full 90° of movement of the secondary door 24* (emphasis added) (Col. 3, Lines 54-57).”

So, in addition to Linstromberg describing that the open position of the secondary door is achieved by swinging the door open on hinges, Linstromberg further describes that the open position of the secondary door is restricted by 90° of movement. By restricting the angular movement of the secondary door to 90° (as shown in FIG. 2), when in the open position the secondary door 24 extends horizontally and supports a receptacle 13 as it protrudes out from the secondary access opening 23. By horizontally extending the secondary door into its open

position, access into the opening from below the open secondary door is blocked by the door.

Thus, Linstromberg does not provide the access as provided by removing the inner door from the outer door frame, as required by the amended independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended independent claims 1, 10, and 14 are patentable over Linstromberg.

Additionally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-9, which depend upon amended independent claim 1, dependent claims 11-13, which depend upon amended independent 10, and dependent claim 15, which depends upon amended independent claim 14, are also patentable as they each depend from a patentable base claim.

The remaining art, namely Lewis Jr., Takasaki, and Johnson, are not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Linstromberg with respect to the amended independent claims. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-6, 11, and 12 are patentable over Linstromberg in view of Lewis Jr. and Takasaki as the combination of Linstromberg, Lewis Jr., and Takasaki do not disclose each and every element of the applicant's claimed invention. Additionally, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is patentable over Linstromberg in view of Johnson as the combination of Linstromberg and Johnson does not disclose each and every element of the applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentable over Linstromberg in view of Takasaki as the combination of Linstromberg and Takasaki does not disclose each and every element of the applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant : Steven L. Carson
Serial No. : 10/060,864
Filed : January 29, 2002
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-593001 / P12776

Accordingly, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

No fees are believed to be due for this amendment, however, if any fees are due, please charge them to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-593001.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorneys for Intel Corporation,

Date: Aug. 4, 2003



Jeffrey J. Barclay
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906